

Staff

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Louis Sterrett

COPY EDITORS
Gabriel Almeida
Mike Bartlett
Austin Carder
Rory Hannigan
Stanley Sharpey
Patrick Unwin

DESIGNERS
Mike Atkinson
Frederik R. Heinz
Chris Mansour

WEB EDITOR
Evan Odell

SOCIAL MEDIA EDITORS
Gabby Gottfried
Grady Lowery

DISTRIBUTION
Erica Gamble

Statement of purpose

Taking stock of the universe of positions and goals that constitutes leftist politics today, we are left with the disquieting suspicion that a deep commonality underlies the apparent variety: What exists today is built upon the desiccated remains of what was once possible.

In order to make sense of the present, we find it necessary to disentangle the vast accumulation of positions on the Left and to evaluate their saliency for the possible reconstitution of emancipatory politics in the present. Doing this implies a reconsideration of what is meant by the Left.

Our task begins from what we see as the general disenchantment with the present state of progressive politics. We feel that this disenchantment cannot be cast off by sheer will, by simply “carrying on the fight,” but must be addressed and itself made an object of critique. Thus we begin with what immediately confronts us.

The *Platypus Review* is motivated by its sense that the Left is disoriented. We seek to be a forum among a variety of tendencies and approaches on the Left—not out of a concern with inclusion for its own sake, but rather to provoke disagreement and to open shared goals as sites of contestation. In this way, the recriminations and accusations arising from political disputes of the past may be harnessed to the project of clarifying the object of leftist critique.

The *Platypus Review* hopes to create and sustain a space for interrogating and clarifying positions and orientations currently represented on the Left, a space in which questions may be raised and discussions pursued that would not otherwise take place. As long as submissions exhibit a genuine commitment to this project, all kinds of content will be considered for publication.

Submission guidelines

Articles will typically range in length from 750–4,500 words, but longer pieces will be considered. Please send article submissions and inquiries about this project to: review_editor@platypus1917.org. All submissions should conform to the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

The *Platypus Review* is funded by:

The University of Chicago Student Government
Dalhousie Student Union
Loyola University of Chicago
School of the Art Institute of Chicago Student Government
The New School
New York University
The University of Illinois at Chicago
The Platypus Affiliated Society

The Platypus Review



Issue #141 | November 2021

1 The dictatorship of the proletariat and the death of the Left

Chris Cutrone

2 COVID, capitalism, and communism

Karyn Pomerantz

3 Empty, pro-imperialist rhetoric

A response to Chris Cutrone’s “Afghanistan”

Hari Kumar

141

www.platypus1917.org

This is the right of bourgeois social relations. The issue is how this social right is contradicted by the necessities and possibilities of industrial production. As I have pointed out elsewhere (in my “What is capitalism?” and “Socialism in the 21st century”), there are two different and increasingly divergent commodities produced by industry: goods for the subsistence of the working class; and surplus value as the fund for investment in production, which can take the form of either paying workers’ wages and/or for technology. It is the apparent conflict of technology vs. human labor that characterizes capitalism on a societal scale.

The industrial forces of production are the productive capacities of society as a whole, whose Marx called the “general social intellect,” whose potential for the production of social wealth has outstripped the social and political rights of appropriation through living human labor by the working class.

The capitalist class represents not the exploitation of the workers but the social value of accumulated labor in capital, the surplus value produced by labor that becomes the precondition for further future production. When the capitalists fail to support the social value of capital as the basis for production, they cease to be capitalists, ceases to be stewards of capital, and become mere moneybags. As Marx put it, a miser is an irrational capitalist whereas a capitalist is a rational miser. The miserliness or “miserly” of capitalistism that Marx had in mind was not the economic efficiency of social investment in production but the impoverished basis for measuring and valuing the social potential of production according to the surplus value that can be produced by human labor and its wages. The wage of labor in capitalistism is that current present production will provide the basis of future production — that human activity and life will thus support itself in an ongoing way through capitalism.

The contradiction Marx found in capitalistism was that what began as a means to an end of social production and wealth, capital, became an end in itself, and what was an end in itself, human life and activity, becomes a mere means to the ends of capital.

The proletariat was Marx’s term for describing and critiquing the existence of the working class in industrial conditions in which there was an increasing divergence and disparity between the value of capital and the value of wages in social production. Marxism called this the expropriation of the working class by capital, in which the workers became less and less able to appropriate the total social product and — most importantly — its potential for future production through its wages as a means of consumption. This was how the working class became “propertyless,” “increasingly socially divested of the property of its labor.” The “virtuous cycle” of bourgeois society became the circuit of capital in production and consumption, as bourgeois social relations and right increasingly undermined and destroyed.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat” continues on page 4.

Positively, this meant the production of value in global capitalism, which is not identical to the production of material wealth in terms of articles of consumption as subsistence goods, but rather where capital as the means of production is produced. This meant the core capitalist countries. This meant the countries where capital as the expression of the “general social intellect” is centralized. The dictatorship of the proletariat must be in the position to at least begin to appropriate the means of production on a global scale. Capital as “dead labor” — historically accumulated labor in the current existing means of production — must be appropriated by the “living labor” of the present working class.

Strategically, this meant a complex and potentially politically quite complicated intervention in the existing capitalist production process, or the current conditions for the production of material wealth (including intellectual wealth), in an ongoing way.

Negatively, it meant that the global working class must be in a position to overcome the reproduction of wage labor as the source of valuation for material wealth. The working class must be in a position to outlaw unemployment and prevent the exploitation of the labor of desperate poor people, in favor of gearing global production towards the production of wealth for human needs and overcoming the social compulsion to labor as part of the valorization process of capital, breaking its cycle of reproduction. What Marx called the “necessity” of the dictatorship of the proletariat was the necessity of breaking the cycle of capitalist reproduction, necessarily on a world-historical and hence global scale.

Until this happens, capitalism will continue. So long as wage labor exists, capital and its contradiction will persist.

So what is capitalism — what is it that needs to be overcome?

Capitalism is the constraint and distortion and deformation of society by the imperative to produce and reproduce the value of capital.

Capital is past labor — the potential for producing wealth or material (including intellectual) goods in society — but in the form of the contradiction Marxism found between the potential of industrial production and the social value of living human labor and the social and political rights deriving from that value. Capitalism, or the capitalist mode of production that produces and reproduces capital, is the contradiction between the bourgeois social relations of labor and the industrial forces of production that are constrained — dominated — by those relations.

It is not the case, as is commonly mistakenly assumed by supposed “Marxists,” that bourgeois social relations means the individual private property in the means of production by members of the capitalist class, and that industrial forces of production means the collective social productive capacity of the working class. No.

The basis of the social rights of property in bourgeois society is the labor of the producers.

In the sense of the Ancient Roman Republic, an active political intervention into society of limited duration.

What was meant by a dictatorship of the “proletariat,” specifically? It meant the political rule of those employed in wage labor, but in a more expansive sense that would include both the unemployed or only potentially employed, and those not employed in wage labor strictly speaking, for instance “middle class” salaried professionals, including the middle-management “white collar” workers of corporate capitalism. But the center of political power was to be the wage-laboring working class.

The dictatorship of the proletariat was a world-historical and hence geopolitical proposition. It was meant to be a global rule of the working class, with revolution encompassing the pondrance of the capitalist world, which means the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the sense rule was meant to be by the working class. The form of such political rule by the working class. Very simply, the proletariat of the proletariat? Very simply, the dictatorship of the proletariat mean by the “dictatorial and hence geopolitical proposition.

What did Marx and Marxism mean by the “dictatorship of the proletariat?” Very simply, the political program of Marxism that culminated in the death of the Left is a measure of its abandonment of this prognosis, intellectual project and political program of Marxism that culminated in the death of the Left is a measure of its abandonment of the proletariat, politically and socially transformative, overruling social and political norms of constitutional government. It was meant to be a “state of emergency” and hence a dictatorship concentrated.



Edouard Manet, “Guerre civile (Civil War)” (1871–74)

Presented as a teach-in at the Platypus Midwest Regional Conference on September 25, 2021 at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, the video of which can be found at <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cn8XcYghyVE>>.

The dictatorship of the proletariat and the death of the Left

Chris Cutrone

Empty, pro-imperialist rhetoric

A response to Chris Cutrone’s “Afghanistan”

Hari Kumar



Abdur Rahman Khan during the Second Anglo-Afghan War (1878–80)

PLATYPUS CONSIDERS ITSELF SOCIALIST.¹ Why does it then print pro-imperialist rhetoric and dismiss “New” and “Old” Lefts? It is one thing to say, “Today there are nothing but idiots.”² Far more disturbing is the following: “The Left [...] under the shadow of the Cold War and Vietnam, cannot acknowledge let alone recognize properly that the U.S. is not the source but only the central — and indispensable — actor in the politics of global capitalism. Anti-Americanism is a sham;” “The U.S. of all things in global capitalism really is ‘too big to fail.’”³

Such extraordinary Left-dressed, theatrical rah-rah — for U.S. imperialism! Cutrone says, “old 20th-century” divisions between imperialist and dependent countries are passé: “there are only First and Third Worlds —and perhaps not even that distinction holds.”⁴

Denying distinctions between imperialist and dependent nations does not unravel Afghanistan events. In contrast, recognizing imperialist dicutms to “divide and rule” to empower indigenous stooges does explain history. In semi-colonial countries, nationalists strive for reforms against imperialisms. How did this play out in British India and Afghanistan up to today? Apparently the depressing story bears repetition.

1. Dividing Afghanistan’s Pashtuns by the imposed Durand Line

Migrations made Afghanistan a multinational state at the end of the 19th century. Only nominally independent, it was left as an un-swallowed “buffer” between the Tsarist Russian Empire and the British Empire in India. The “Iron Amir,” Abdur Rahman Khan, summarized the dilemma in 1900: “How can a small power like Afghanistan, which is like a goat between these lions [Britain and Tsarist Russia], or a grain of wheat between two strong millstones of the grinding mill, stand in the midway of the stones without being ground to dust?”⁵

Afghan monarchs from the Durrani tribe of the Pushtun nation attempted to gain nationalist independence to varying degrees. Afghanistan’s eastern boundary was tested by three Anglo-Afghan wars, which were never completely won by the British. Yet Britain was able to impose the 1893 Durand Line on Afghan rulers. This divided the Pashtun and Baluch territories, forcing portions into imperial India. This was to be the seed of Pashtunistani nationalism, threatening later Pakistani leaders — one example of the enduring principle of divide and rule, routinely applied to the Indian “jewel” of the British Empire.

2. Two sections of indigenous capitalists

National capitalists are indigenous capitalists resisting foreign control. In the early 20th century they derived inspiration from the then anti-imperialist, socialist USSR. Indigenous capitalists faced several problems. First, while they needed workers to effect democratic reforms, they feared the masses. Moreover their countries previously had miniscule working classes anyway, often being peasant-based and “feudal.” Pseudo-socialist programs led by nationalists enabled attacks on tribal and feudal remnants while state resources went to capitalist development. Historically, however, they faced increasing control by imperialism. Sometimes weak nationalists tried joining forces (e.g., the Bandung Non-Aligned movement). Finally, if indigenous capitalists did attain power, they tried to minimize “aid” or strings-debts, often bargaining in imperialist-shopping. Fading British imperialism (especially after Suez), was often out-bidder by one — sometimes both — of the two newer dominant world powers, the U.S. and post-1953 USSR. (The USSR economic basis changed from socialism into capitalism.)⁶

Meanwhile other capitalists found profit in imperialism, becoming business facilitators, compradors, or agents. They often allied with rural landlords. Over time they also increasingly “bargained.” Pakistan escalated this into manipulating the U.S.

3. British divide and rule of imperial India

British imperialists refined the art of transforming dangerous militants into tame compradors. Allan Hume, shrewdly created the Indian Congress Party in 1885 to neutralize democratic Indians: “A safety valve for the escape of great and growing forces generated by our own action, was urgently needed and no more efficacious safety-valve than our Congress movement could possibly be devised.”⁷

After World War II, direct colonial rule was replaced by indirect neo-colonialism. Sir Stafford Cripps admitted to parliament:

What, then, were the alternatives which faced us? Those alternatives were fundamentally two [...] first, we could attempt to strengthen British control in India [with] [...] a considerable reinforcement of

British troops [...] The second alternative was, we could accept the fact that the first alternative was not possible, and make a further attempt to persuade the Indians to come together [...] One thing that was, I think, quite obviously, impossible was to decide to continue our responsibility indefinitely — and, indeed, against our own wishes — into a period when we had not the power to carry it out.⁸

4. Partition of India

In 1933, Chaudhuri Rahmat Ali at Cambridge University, proposed a multinational partitioning of Muslim-majority parts of India into “PAKSTAN”: P (Punjab), A (“Afghanistan,” i.e., the North-West Frontier Province), K (Kashmir), S (Sind), TAN (Balochistan) — this became “Pakistan” (“the Land of Pure”). In 1947, Britain’s direct colonial rule ended with two dominions, India and Pakistan.

The 1947 Partition into “India” and “Pakistan” was not on the basis of ethnicity, but rather religious belief. The Indian Empire was divided between two dominions, creating a permanent tension between them, strengthening continued domination. It led to migrations, refugees, and persecuted minorities.

In 1947, the Durand Line remained the frontier dividing Pashtuns between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Balochistan became an oppressed nation under the dominant Punjabi nation of the state of Pakistan. This lit the long fuse of the “Pashtunistan” national question still burning today.

5. The multinational, feudal character of Afghanistan

Afghanistan is a land-locked, multinational state dominated by the Pashtuns in “a tribal confederation comprising multi-racial groups and nationalities.”⁹ Roughly, Pashtuns comprise 40% of those speaking Dari or Pashto (in two factions, Abdali or Durranni Pushtuns (usually the rulers) and Ghilzai Pushtuns). Persian speaking Hazaras (9%) and Tajiks (25%) inhabit the Hindu Kush. Further North, Uzbeks (9%), Turcomans, Kyrgyz, and others speak Turkic languages.

Till the 1980s, Afghanistan was predominantly agricultural with a large nomadic population. Before the Russian invasion, 88% of the total population of Afghanistan lived in rural areas.¹⁰

It is thought that in 1975, the population approximated 17 millions, of whom 14% (2.4 million) were in urban areas.¹¹ In 1966–67, 77% of people were agriculturists, while only 6% were in industry or handicrafts, and 2.2% worked in construction and mines.¹² The predominant mode of production was tribal feudalism with the khan, who was “economic lord and master of peasants, and their unquestioned military, tribal, and administrative leader.”¹³

The khans (Durrani Pushtuns) were installed around 1740.¹⁴ The mullah was a landowning, religious man.¹⁵ Both malik (administrative official) and mir-i-aab (owner of the water) were khan-appointed.¹⁶ Only 12% of land was arable, which was concentrated in a few hands: “In 1978 [...] 5% of the landowners were in possession of 45% of all cultivable land. About 83% of owners held between 5–10 acres of largely uneconomic land. [...] In 1978 there were thirty families in the country whose holding consisted of between 500 and 50,000 acres of agricultural land.”¹⁷

Crops had five values derived from land, water, labor, capital, and seed.¹⁸ The peasant obtained only one-fifth of the yield; as land, capital, and seed were from landlords, and water from the mir-i-aab. The peasant being of the same tribe as landlord-khans was subject to tribal obligations. Khan, malik, mullah, and mirab made up the village council Jirgah to control rural life. Debts that were often inherited over generations dispossessed small land-parcels. The peasantry became a landless, agricultural proletariat working for payment in kind or cash. Later entry of tractors into villages, further worsened the life of peasants.

Even in 1978 there were 2.5 million nomads. The poorest joined the agricultural workers. But the wealthiest nomads, originally camel traders, became truckers, merchant capitalists, or money lenders. Commercial capital centered on the money bazaars of Kabul and Kandahar, but was initially controlled by Indians.¹⁹

As late as 1978, most non-state industry was owned by the Pakistani bourgeoisie. National Afghan capitalists centered in traditional trades of fruits and carpets.²⁰ Nonetheless a small, national-owned industry was started in the 1930s, by the merchant Abdull Majid Zabuli. Despite mullah resistance to usury, Zabuli also established a bank. The government levied customs duties, which was its main revenue stream, engendering close relations with smugglers.

6. Early governments attempt to modernize but are obstructed by mullahs

Amir Abdur Rahman began a slow centralization, without interfering with Islamic tribal structures. In contrast King Amunullah (1919–29) tried modernizing Afghanistan, and banning the *purdah* (veil). Religious opposition overthrew him: “[Fol-lowing] Kemalism [in] Turkey [...] [he] promoted Western education, equality of the sexes, Western law not Islamic, agricultural modernization [...] religious and tribal leaders denounced these reforms as un-Islamic [...] Massive revolts in the countryside overthrew Amanullah in 1929.”²¹

King Nadir Shah’s short reign (1931–33) accommodated rural conservatism. The *Loya Jirgah* consisted of a reactionary monarchy allied to landowning chiefs and mullahs. All gains of women were repealed. Pushtu was declared the national language.²²

After Nadir’s assassination, King Zahir Shah’s reign continued as “stagnation.”²³ Notwithstanding intentions, by 1947 a liberal movement began in the “Awakened Youth” (Wikh-i Zalmaiyan) movement. In relatively free elections in 1949 they had success, but were suppressed in 1953.²⁴

But pressure to modernize was building. The first U.S. contracts developed the Helmand River project. Increasingly, traders became thwarted by Pakistani blocks on trade routes. This spurred aid from the USSR for “an alternative trading outlet to break the country’s previous dependence on trade via Pakistan. In 1950, the Soviet Union and Af-

ghanistan signed a new trade agreement; over the next five years, trade between the two countries rose by 50 per cent, with the Soviet Union taking a fifth of Afghanistan’s exports. In 1961, another crisis year, 55 per cent of Afghan trade was with or through the Soviet Union.”²⁵

In 1954 a \$3.5 million loan, and in 1955 loans of \$100 million ensured the revisionist USSR became the dominant ally.²⁶ Meanwhile Pakistan had joined the U.S.-run Baghdad Pact. By 1965, new elections were called. At Soviet revisionist urging, a united People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) won three of five Kabul seats.²⁷

7. Who was the PDPA?

The PDPA was formed in 1965, by middle-class intelligentsia, civil servants, and teachers. But even this progressive movement contained tribal-based divisions. Nur Mohammed Taraki, a low-ranking civil servant and Hafizullah Amin, a teacher, organized the “Khalq” (people) faction.²⁸ Babrak Karmal, a member of the Durrani Pashtun aristocracy, had close links to the monarchy. With Mir Akbar Khyber of the Military Academy, they formed the “Parcham” (flag) faction. These factions represented distinct strata:

Parchamites came from Persian-influenced, urban, upper-class backgrounds. Since many had family ties with the ruling elite, the Khalqis branded them the “Royal Communist Party.” [They] spoke Dari, and were culturally isolated from Pushtun tribal life. By contrast, Khalqis represented the rising, newly educated, lower-middle-class Pushtuns from small towns and rural areas who wanted Pushtun influence to be dominant but also favored reclaiming lost territories.²⁹

The Khalq openly called for a “national united front of patriotic, democratic progressive forces” including the “national bourgeois.” To carry the masses it called for the “primary objective of creating a socialist society.”³⁰

But their real ambition was revealed in talking to American diplomats: “On 14 March 1965, Taraki described the party as a left of center political party: ‘designed primarily to assist the middle class, to elevate the lower ranks of the population, and to obtain assistance from the wealthier elements for this purpose. [...] slightly left of center [...] to pre-empt [...] Daud who [...] talks of his fondness for ‘socialism.’”³¹ Even so, this was more progressive than Parcham who wanted to “assure the king that we are not Communists.”³²

The Khalq represented the interests of the working class, peasantry, and the national capitalist class. But it was dominated by the national capitalist class. Parcham represented the interest of the feudal and monarchist landowners. However, both factions were supported by the USSR revisionists against Daoud.³³

8. The Daoud Coup ties itself to the USA, though allowing some modernization

In 1973, Prime Minister Daoud led a military coup against his cousin King Zahir. This signalled new modernization. Daoud called for support from the revisionist USSR, who had trained his officers.³⁴ The Parcham wing of Karmal joined Daoud’s coalition government at Moscow’s behest. The Khalqis of Taraki and Amin deemed Daoud policies “too conservative.”³⁵

Indeed, Daoud retreated on several fronts. While proposing new land reforms, he never enacted them. This happened despite “urban-based land speculators” entering rural areas who “diluted the influence of the feudal landowners.”³⁶ Daoud’s original objection to Zahir’s U.S. and Iranian sponsorship was dropped: “Daoud was a militant nationalist who believed that the King had betrayed Afghan interests by agreeing to a treaty giving Iran access to waters of the Helmand River.”³⁷

Daoud had previously argued for an independent “Pashtunistan”: “Daoud had long spearheaded Afghan irredentist demands for an independent, Afghan-linked “Pashtunistan” and [...] a Baluch state linking Baluch areas in Pakistan and Iran with Afghanistan.”³⁸

Daoud went West. Enter the Shah of Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Henry Kissinger.³⁹ This led to a \$2 billion “aid” package, Savak agents thrown in gratis. This was the first entry of Wahhabi fundamentalism in Afghanistan:

Iran [...] replace[d] the USSR as Kabul’s biggest aid donor, and a projected rail and highway network linking Afghanistan to Persian Gulf ports would have canceled out Afghan dependence on Soviet trade and transport outlets [...] The Shah’s intelligence agency, Savak [...] and the CIA worked [...] with underground Afghan Islamic fundamentalist groups [...] [and] Ikhwān ul-Musulmān [Muslim Brotherhood] and the Rabitat-al-Alam-at-Islami [Muslim World League] Saudi Wahabi orthodoxy [...] Savak channeled U.S. weapons, communications equipment, and paramilitary aid to anti-Daoud groups.⁴⁰

Pakistan, Savak, the CIA, and covert fundamentalists launched abortive, anti-Daoud coup attempts in 1973 and 1974.⁴¹ Nonetheless, by 1974, Daoud was firmly tied to the U.S. He purged Moscow supporters, ruptured relations with PDPA, and ratified a treaty to share Helmand waters with Iran, for which he had previously castigated King Zahir. He reneged on calls for “Pashtunistan.”⁴²

The 1974 economic agreement between Daoud and the Shah of Iran, moved Afghanistan away from its dependence on the Soviet Union.⁴³

9. The 1978 Saur (Taurus) Revolution

Absent a mass workers movement, the Khalq led an anti-Daoud coup with military allies. Led by the national capitalist class, from weakness it was forced to ally with pro-USSR Parchamite compradors. Nonetheless it displaced Durrani Pashtuns by Ghilzai Pashtuns for the first time. Taraki’s government included Karmal and Amin.

The program of national democratic reforms attacked feudalism and illiteracy. Decree No. 6 targeted rural mortgages-debts; No. 7 marriage and bride-prices; No. 8 land tenure.⁴⁴ But despite “only 2.2% of landowners holding 42% of land,” Afghan peasants opposed land reform.⁴⁵ Why? Feudal conservatism was fervently organized by Pakistan and the U.S. to destabilize the government. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brezhniski’s adopted the policy “Sowing shit — in Russia’s backyard.”⁴⁶ This was when pro-U.S., comprador fundamentalists [Buhanuddin Rabbani and Gulbuddin Hekmatyr] emerged.⁴⁷ We will see them later.

As Taraki stalled, Amin pushed on but was deemed by Moscow too independent: “Karmal and the Parchamites [were] ‘more reasonable, more willing to listen [...] The Khalqis were ‘too radical, too headstrong, too unpredictable.’”⁴⁸

While pro-Brezhnevite Russians portray Amin as a pro-U.S. tool, he merely insisted upon Afghan independence: “in friendship with all countries and utilisation of economic assistance rendered [...] *with no regard to the socio-economic system of the aid-giving country*, provided aid is unconditional and with the principle of non-interference in the affairs of one another and respect to national independence;” “No Soviet military bases will be built in Afghanistan because we do not need them.”⁴⁹

That was not enough for Russia. Selig Harrison wrote of Amin, “I found him a formidable strongly nationalistic figure clearly not prepared to play the role of supine puppet. His confident attitude [...] was that he knew how to handle the Russians, who needed him.”⁵⁰

Amin overplayed his hand. Yuri Andropov, Boris Ponomarev, and Dmitriy Ustinov ordered Russian troop invasion. Amin was killed, and compliant Parcham puppets were empowered: first Karmal, later Muhammed Najibullah. By 1984, 150,000 USSR troops and 10,000 non-military “advisers” occupied Afghanistan. Afghan National resistance grew into the National Islamic Front in 1979,⁵¹ comprising seven groups, including the “Afghan Arabs” of Osama bin Laden. From the start it was largely controlled by Pakistan and the U.S. The U.S. initially invested \$625 million.⁵² Appalling troop losses forced Russian retreat in 1988. But only after 3–5 million refugees flooded Pakistan and Iran,⁵³ leaving 15,000 Russian dead (but uncounted Afghan dead) and costing Russia \$5 billion per year.⁵⁴

After the 1988 Geneva Accords established a cease-fire, the stooge Najibullah lasted three years despite unrelenting attacks. By now only an utterly destroyed rural and urban infra-structure remained.⁵⁵ Former khans were now dependent warlords: “competing leaders dependent on opposing politically motivated military assistance; population subsistent on politically motivated humanitarian aid; destruction of the rural subsistence economy [...] flight of millions of mainly rural refugees to camps and cities in Pakistan and Iran; creation of refugee-warrior communities.”⁵⁶

10. From Mujahadeen Civil War to Taliban Regime to U.S. comprador regimes of Hamid Karzai to chaotic exit

Mujahadeen factions escalated rivalries into open civil war, fueled by Pakistani secret services ISI and CIA. Revenues, ethnic, tribal, and religious affiliations drove rivalry. Pakistan and its U.S. paymasters favored Pashtun Hikmetyar over Ahmed Shah Masud, a Tajik. Pakistan wanted to secure “Durand” borders against Pushtun separatism, and build a Kashmiri mujahideen against India. Cash stakes were enormous, excluding extras like “Stinger” missiles: “Congress secretly allocated \$470 million for Afghan covert action in 1986 [...] upped to \$630 million in 1987, with matching funds from Saudi Arabia. [...] A regional commander drew a CIA retainer of \$20,000–\$30,000 a month [...] more influential leaders \$50,000 a month.”⁵⁷

Revenues from arms, foreign relief aid, opium, smuggling, and money-laundering were invested overseas.⁵⁸ The ISI formalized transnational trade in transport, smuggling, and opioids, linking Pakistan, Asia, Gulf-states, and Iran.

But recruits were needed. Jamiat-e-Ulema Islami (JUI), led by Maulana Fazlur Rehman, ran religious schools for impoverished students. By 1988, over half a million students were in 8,000 registered and 25,000 unregistered madrassas, all funded by Pakistan (both Zia ul Haq and Benazir Bhutto), Saudi Arabia, and the U.S.⁵⁹ Students were drafted as Mujahideen, watching as commanders become corrupt warlords.⁶⁰

Factionalism hampered the anti-Najibullah war. New government appeared imminent. The 1992 Peshawar Accords attempted unity, making a Tajik, Burhanuddin Rabbani president and Pashtun Hikmetyar PM. Urged by Pakistan, Hikmetyar demanded sole power. Ultimately Kabul fell to Masud’s Tajiks and Uzbeks (under General Dostum). Hikmetyar shelled Kabul “mercilessly.”⁶¹

By 1994, disillusioned ascetic students formed “Taliban” (*Talib*: seeking knowledge). Led by Mullah Mohammed Omar, dominated by Bin Laden’s Wahhabis, they allied with Hikmetyar. Weary ex-Mujahideen joined. Saudi wealth helped form the 1996 Taliban “Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan” under Sharia law. Masud’s forces now retreated to regroup as the “Northern Alliance” of Tajiks, Uzbeks, and minorities.

But after the 9/11 Wahhabi terrorist airplane attacks on New York, the U.S. launched open war. Carpet-bombing created high civilian casualties (“Collateral damage,” said Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld). The Taliban was overthrown with a “light footprint,” CIA and Special Forces coordinating the “Northern Alliance.”⁶²

Any surrender of the Taliban to Interim President Karzai in 2001 was rejected by Rumsfeld: “The Taliban were completely defeated. [...] Karzai envisioned surrender keeping militants from playing significant role [...] But ‘The US is not inclined to negotiate surrenders,’ Rumsfeld said [...] ‘Omar captured or dead.’”⁶³

Under UN cover, a comprador government for the U.S. headed by Karzai, was installed. International forces included “the first NATO military operation outside Europe.”⁶⁴ Many pro-U.S. warlords were brought back by the CIA for infrastructure support.⁶⁵

Taliban (Pashtun) regrouped, resisting Hamid Karzai: “Karzai’s regime empowered three groups, Tajiks, Uzbeks and Hazaras. [...] Tajiks who constitute only 27% of the Afghan population, still make up 70% of officers in the Afghan army. Although Karzai himself is a Pashtun, many fellow tribesmen view his presence as mere window-dressing for a U.S.-devised realignment of long-established power relations in the country, dating back to 2001 when the U.S. toppled the overwhelmingly Pashtun Taliban.”⁶⁶

Allied forces contended with corrupt Afghan army leadership. The U.S. began undermining Karzai, but he tried to negotiate a truce. The Taliban was trying not to be purely Pashtun, and the truce “resonated with many Afghans.”⁶⁷ However, occupying forces continued killing. Obama oversaw 542 drone strikes and an estimated 3,797 deaths, including 324 civilians. “Obama told aides: ‘Turns out I’m really good at killing people. Didn’t know that was gonna be a strong suit of mine.’”⁶⁸ Karzai gave way to Ashraf Ghani. Unsurprisingly both men and women in the countryside detested the U.S. and NATO forces who killed indiscriminately.⁶⁹

Obama gave way to Trump, who gave way to Biden. All wanted cheaper means to control Afghanistan than paying the blood-price of occupation. They would leave it to Pakistan to guard U.S. interests. Hence imperialism’s “exit” fiasco.

Preliminary balance sheets are grim: “2,500 Americans had died fighting on Afghan soil, along with almost 1,000 troops from allies like Britain and Canada.”⁷⁰ But “the toll for Afghans has been far higher: At least 240,000 Afghans have died [...] many civilians [...] [By] estimates, American taxpayers had spent two trillion dollars.”⁷¹

The Taliban government is led by Mullah Abdul Ghani Baradar. Sirajuddin Haqqani (son of Jalaluddin Haqqani) is interior minister. The Haqqani allied to al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden.

11. What comes next?

In the immediate term imperialists serve pablum: “Foreign Minister Wang to Blinken: China stood ready to work with US ‘for a soft landing.’”⁷²

Nonetheless, imperial selfish interests demand, at minimum, material assets. Several new factors demand analysis, including perhaps these.

First, despite drastic humiliation, comprehensive calculations still place the U.S. as imperialist nation No. 1, though challenged by China.⁷³ The EU will develop its own military force, also indicating the U.S. weakening. Similarly there are strong trading linkages between Germany to China and Russia.⁷⁴

Secondly, China has interests in Afghanistan: “to ensure Islamic extremism in Afghanistan does not spread to China’s Xinjiang region.”⁷⁵ “Close to home along the Af-Pak frontier [...] The Turkistan Islamic Party is believed to be the successor to the East Turkestan Islamic Movement.”⁷⁶

Afghanistan is likely the beggar: “In 2018, 80% of Afghanistan’s \$11bn public expenditure came from donors [...] Even during Obama years, Washington encouraged China to invest in the Aynak copper mine because of the scale of revenue it could provide to Afghanistan.”⁷⁷

Moreover: “China’s long-term strategic investment [includes] the Belt-and-Road Initiative [...] If extended from Pakistan to Afghanistan [...] it would open up a shorter land route to markets in the Middle East. [...] Kabul [makes] India’s resistance to joining less consequential.”⁷⁸

Thirdly, there are important resources at stake. Even in 2002, oil lines across Afghanistan borders were enticing: “Oil and gas-rich Central Asian states, in particular Turkmenistan, saw Afghanistan as a possible pipeline route to connect to world markets.”⁷⁹

Now other lucrative assets have been discovered: “Afghanistan rests upon vast mineral and energy reserves, which the US Geological Survey values at \$1 trillion and the Afghanistan Minister of Mines values at about \$3 trillion [...] total amount of Chinese investment in Afghanistan reached \$521 million and construction contracts reached \$899 million by the end of June 2016.”⁸⁰ “Afghanistan has what China most prizes: opportunities in infrastructure and industry building [...] and access to \$1 trillion in untapped mineral deposits, including critical industrial metals such as lithium, iron, copper and cobalt.”⁸¹

Finally, Pakistan was irked by statements from Karzai and the Taliban on Pashtunistan, rejecting the “Durand Line”: “The Karzai government [and] insurgent groups operating in both states including the Afghan Taliban and the Haqqanis in Pakistan do not recognise the legality of the border.”⁸²

Complicating matters is the anti-Pakistani Tahafuz movement developed in Pakistani-held tribal lands: “The Pashtun Tahafuz Movement [*Pashtun Protection Movement*] [...] demanded an end to atrocities by Pakistan army and police in the Tribal Areas [...] A huge number of young Pashtuns [were] killed and abducted [...] labelled as terrorists for Pakistani Taliban [...] feared as supporters of Afghanistan’s Greater Pashtunistan.”⁸³

12. To Conclude

Cutrone seems to think the U.S. “will be missed”: “One thing is certain: The U.S. served as well as checked all [powers] in Afghanistan and was thus both welcome and unwelcome there to all. The U.S. will be missed.”⁸⁴

He concludes incorrectly: “There is no new Cold War between the U.S. and China nor is there an inter-imperialist rivalry between them.”⁸⁵

Marxists in both Afghanistan and the West wishing to assist peoples of colonial-type countries should support breaking away from imperialist sway, while simultaneously creating independent Marxist movements moving to socialism away from nationalism. Obfuscating U.S. imperialism’s power — or any other imperialism including China — can only serve reactionary ends. **IP**

⁷¹ Gibbs, “The peasant as counter-revolutionary.”

⁷² Cf. Halliday, “Revolution in Afghanistan” and Gibbs, “The peasant.”

⁷³ Halliday, “Revolution in Afghanistan.”

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Diego Cordovez and Selig S. Harrison, *Out of Afghanistan: The Inside Story of the Soviet Withdrawal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 15.

⁷⁸ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*, 21.

⁷⁹ Cordovez and Harrison, *Out of Afghanistan*, 18–19.

⁸⁰ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*, 42–44.

⁸¹ US Embassy memo, cited; Faridullah Bezhani, “Parties Afghanistan, 1964–73,” *Iranian Studies* 46 (2013): 921–41.

⁸² Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*, 21.

⁸³ Fred Halliday and Zahir Tanin, “The Communist Regime in Afghanistan 1978–1992: Institutions and Conflicts,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 50, no. 8 (1998): 1357.

⁸⁴ Gibbs, “The peasant as counter-revolutionary.”

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*.

⁸⁷ Cordovez and Harrison, *Out of Afghanistan*, 14.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 14–17.

⁸⁹ Gibbs, “The peasant as counter-revolutionary.”

⁹⁰ Cordovez and Harrison, *Out of Afghanistan*, 14.

⁹¹ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*.

⁹² Cordovez and Harrison, *Out of Afghanistan*, 14.

⁹³ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*.

⁹⁴ Ibid. See also Halliday and Tanin, “The Communist Regime.”

⁹⁵ Gibbs, “The peasant as counter-revolutionary.”

⁹⁶ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*, 148.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 110, 124, 171–74, 184.

⁹⁸ Cordovez and Harrison, *Out of Afghanistan*, 18–19.

⁹⁹ Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan*, 110, 124, 171–74, 184.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ahmed Rashid, *Jihad: The Rise of Militant Islam In Central Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 2.

¹⁰² Anwar, “Tragedy of Afghanistan,” 223–32.

¹⁰³ Thomas Barfield, *The War for Afghanistan: A Very Brief History* (Princeton: Princeton Shorts, 2012), 8.

¹⁰⁴ Fred Halliday, “A Cold War tragedy in Afghanistan that the world forgot,” *Irish Times*, May 5, 1996.

¹⁰⁵ Barfield, *The War for Afghanistan*.

¹⁰⁶ Barnett Rubin, “The Political Economy of War and Peace in Afghanistan,” *World Development* 28, no. 10 (2000): 1789–1803.

¹⁰⁷ Steve Coll, *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), 151.

¹⁰⁸ Rubin, “The Political Economy of War.”

¹⁰⁹ Rashid, *Taliban*, 89.

¹¹⁰ Anand Gopal, “The Other Afghan Women: Rural Areas Hope Taliban Rule Will End Decades of U.S. & Warlord Violence,” *Democracy Now*, September 16, 2021, available online at <https://www.democracynow.org/2021/9/16/anand_gopal_afghanistan_womens_rights>.

¹¹¹ Rashid, *Taliban*, 117–27.

¹¹² Barnett R. Rubin, “Saving Afghanistan,” *Foreign Affairs* 86, no. 1 (January 2007): 57–78.

¹¹³ Alissa J. Rubin, “Did the War in Afghanistan Have to Happen?,” *New York Times*, August 23, 2021.

¹¹⁴ Rashid, *Taliban*, 89.

¹¹⁵ Anand Gopal, “The Other Afghan Women,” *The New Yorker*, September 6, 2021.

¹¹⁶ William Dalrymple, “A Deadly Triangle: Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India,” *The Brookings Essay*, June 25, 2013, available online at <http://csweb.brookings.edu/content/research/essays/2013/deadly-triangle-afghanistan-pakistan-india-c.html>.

¹¹⁷ Ahmed Rashid, “How Obama Lost Karzai,” *Foreign Policy* (March 2011): 71–76. See also Nancy Lindisfarne and Jonathan Neele, “Afghanistan: The End of the Occupation,” *Solidarity*, August 19, 2021, available online at <https://solidarity-us.org/afghanistan-the-end-of-the-occupation/>; and Gopal, “The Other Afghan Women,” *The New Yorker*.

¹¹⁸ Micah Zenko, “Obama’s Final Drone Strike Data,” *Council of Foreign Relations*, January 20, 2017, available online at <https://www.cfr.org/blog/obamas-final-drone-strike-data>.

¹¹⁹ Nancy Lindisfarne and Jonathan Neale, “Afghanistan: The end of occupation,” *Mondoweiss*, August 20, 2021, available online at <https://mondoweiss.net/2021/08/afghanistan-the-end-of-the-occupation/>. See also Gopal, “The Other Afghan Women,” *The New Yorker*.

¹²⁰ Gopal, “The Other Afghan Women,” *Democracy Now*.

¹²¹ Rubin, “Did the War in Afghanistan Have to Happen?”

¹²² Zhou Bo, “In Afghanistan, China Is Ready to Step Into the Void,” *New York Times*, August 20, 2021.

¹²³ Tony Norfield, “World Power,” *Economics of Imperialism*, September 14, 2021, available online at <https://economicsofimperialism.blogspot.com/2021/09/world-power.html>.

¹²⁴ Hari Kumar, “An Initial Assessment of Angela Merkel’s Legacy,” *The Left Berlin*, July 25, 2021, available at <https://www.theleftberlin.com/an-initial-assessment-of-angela-merkel-legacy/>.

¹²⁵ Azeta Hatief and L. R. Luqiu, “Where does Afghanistan fit in China’s grand project?: A content analysis of Afghan and Chinese news coverage of the One Belt, One Road initiative,” *International Communication Gazette* 80, no. 6 (2018): 551–69.

¹²⁶ Michael Clarke, “‘One Belt, One Road’ and China’s Emerging Afghanistan Dilemma,” *Australian Journal Of International Affairs* 70, no. 5 (2016): 563–79.

¹²⁷ Vincent Ni, “China will tread carefully in navigating the Taliban’s return,” *The Guardian*, August 17, 2021.

¹²⁸ Hatief and Luqiu, “Where does Afghanistan fit.”

¹²⁹ Hari Kumar, “The Afghanistan War of 2002 – Legacy of USA Imperialism and Social-Imperialism,” *Alliance* 45 (2002), republished by *Marxist-Leninist Currents Today*, August 21, 2021, available online at <http://ml-today.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/afghanistan-war-2002.pdf>.

¹³⁰ Hatief and Luqiu, “Where does Afghanistan fit.”

¹³¹ Bo, “In Afghanistan, China is Ready.”

¹³² Amina Khan, “Pakistan-Afghanistan Relations: Post 2014 Challenges,” *Strategic Studies* 34, no. 2/3 (2015): 20–46.

¹³³ Praveesh K. Gupta, “Pashtunistan Factor In Pakistan-Afghanistan Relations,” *Himalayan* 23, no. 3/4 (2019): 96–123.

¹³⁴ Cutrone, “Afghanistan.”

¹³⁵ Ibid.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat,” cont. from page 1

themselves. There were thus value-crises in capital, which were crises of society as a whole. The result of these crises was the destruction of the value of both wages and capital. Capital became less profitable, the wage-earning potential of labor decreased, money went without opportunities for productive investment, and workers went unemployed. This was especially true at a generational level in which the reproduction of capital did away with jobs and the continued reproduction of workers created masses of unemployed and unemployable people.

Industrial production made human labor increasingly superfluous to the production of wealth, and thus the social value of human activity and life became not realized through productive activity but negated by it. Marxism thought that this meant the possibility and necessity of overcoming the valuing of human activity and life through labor as a measure of social wealth. This was the motivation for the proletarianized working class’s struggle for socialism.

In today’s terms of measuring social wealth through GDP (Gross Domestic Product) and Per Capita Productivity and Purchasing Power Parity, there is a contradiction between these indices of

economic activity and actual individual and collective life and wellbeing in society. The United States has remained the highest GDP and PPP country in the world, with the highest productivity of labor. And yet there are increasing numbers of unemployed and unemployable people, and what labor employment exists and increases consists of new forms of work that are — temporarily — not yet replaceable by technology, for instance the “service sector.”

This is the immiseration of society in capitalism that Marx observed and which has continued up to today.

In socialism, the industrial superfluosity of workers was to be replaced by the superfluosity of work. As Marx envisioned it, work was to go from “life’s prime need” to “life’s prime want” — people would work because they wanted to, not because they needed to do so, either individually or collectively. The possibilities of science and technology as a higher form of social cooperation than the division of labor would allow “from each according to his ability and to each according to his need.”

The increased specialized division of labor in bourgeois social cooperation continues, but with an increasing and intensifying gulf opening between the new forms of social interdependence thus created and the forms of socially valuing and supporting the laboring activity and human lives thus employed.

Bourgeois demands for recognition of equal social and political rights to participation in and contribution to as well as share in consumption and production and reproduction of present and future wealth come up against the limits of the bourgeois form of such rights — the value of laboring activity — and the value of capital as measure of social production and consumption: the limits of capitalism as a self-contradiction of bourgeois society in industrial production.

The politically strategic vision of Marxism was that, to break the repetitive cycle of capitalist crisis and destruction, the wage-laborers would need to abolish wage labor — the laborers would need to abolish labor. It was not enough that the capitalists destroyed capitalism — that capitalism destroyed capital. The very basis for the reproduction of capital — labor — must be overcome. What society already was doing in capitalism in an unconscious and self-alienated way must be overcome in a disalienated and self-conscious way. But first it would need to be done consciously: the working class must politically and socially take over and appropriate capitalism before it can be overcome.

Thus was the Marxist vision of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The death of the Left

Today, the ostensible “Left” — the avowed “socialists” — have abandoned the goal of the dictatorship of the proletariat, either in words or in fact, the latter by reinterpreting the dictatorship of the proletariat to mean the governing of capitalism by sociologically working-class political parties in a welfare-state or so-called “social democracy.”

For instance, the DSA (Democratic Socialists of America) *Jacobin* magazine publisher Bhaskar Sunkara has recently offered that perhaps achieving socialism in the United States is impossible, but what is possible is “social democracy,” by which he meant a better social welfare state.

But even to the extent that Sunkara and his *Jacobin* comrades still claim to be not social democrats but rather (small-d) democratic socialists and aspire for something greater than welfare-state capitalism, they still base their vision on an earlier 20th-century liquidation of Marxism and its goal of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For instance, Ralph Miliband is a major influence for *Jacobin*. This is true for *Jacobin*-associated *Catalyst* journal editor Vivek Chibber’s essay “Our Road to Power,” which contrasted the current DSA’s political program to the older Marxism of Kautsky, Luxemburg and Lenin.

Miliband’s idea was that in the 20th century the state had become much more important as an actor in capitalism, and that the working class was less socially and politically excluded than it had been in the time of classical Marxism, with the result being that the working class neither could nor should renounce participation politically in the capitalist state, for instance through working-class parties elected to government. The working class is supposedly no longer barred from political power in capitalism.

This is of course far less plausible today, after a generation — 40–50 years of neoliberalism — now, than when Miliband originally formulated his perspective, in the decades after WWII.

But even conceding Miliband’s — and the current DSA’s — point, the issue is the identification of workers’ or labor parties with socialist politics, or governing the capitalist state with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The issue is the Marxist vision of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transition to, and not identical with, socialism. It is not merely a matter of political exclusion producing a need for revolution. At issue is the possibility of gradually evolving socialism out of capitalism through increasing state control over and welfare provisions in capitalism.

Historically, this has produced not the working class transforming capitalism into socialism, but rather the transformation of nominally “socialist” parties into political parties of governing capitalism, turning the working class’s social and political organizations into appendages of the capitalist state.

Because there has not been by any means the uninterrupted governance of capitalism by working-class and ostensibly “socialist” parties, this hypothetical reforming of capitalism into socialism appears to not have been definitively disproven, and remains a tantalizing prospect.

Whereas “socialist” or “communist” parties were meant to be more than merely social democratic, what has happened rather is the lowering of socialist and even communist politics to social democracy or welfare-statist capitalism. This has been called the “betrayal” of socialism by these parties, and has produced new movements for socialism, for instance by the 1960s–70s New Left and even more recently, during the crisis of the Great Recession, in the however brief upsurges, at least electorally, of new “Left” movements and parties claiming to be socialist, against the existing social-democratic and socialist parties, such as SYRIZA in Greece and Podemos in Spain. Furthermore, there were the phenomena

of Jeremy Corbyn’s “socialist” leadership of the Labour Party and the Bernie Sanders Campaign for President in the Democratic Party in the U.S. All of these held out the promise of “democratic socialism,” at least eventually, even if it was posed merely as reversing the erosion of the welfare state in the past generation of neoliberal capitalism.

There is also of course the 20th-century counterexample of the “undemocratic socialism” in the Soviet Union and associated countries. Even though the recent cycle of “socialism” by the Millennial Left in its social-democratic aspirations was accompanied, as its shadow, by a neo-Stalinism of “tankie” Marxist-Leninists, the “democratic socialism” of the new social democrats is not really pitched against the threat of Stalinist authoritarian socialism of communism, but the latter does remain an obstacle to a true understanding of the original Marxist vision of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Moreover, Stalinism is seen as an authoritarian welfare state to which is opposed a more “democratic” one. What this ignores is that Stalinism was (and remains) democratic — perhaps as democratic as or even more so than capitalist democracy — (see for instance Cuba), but is not as liberal as the (ostensible) liberal democracy of capitalism.

Perhaps the most pernicious legacy of Stalinism is its equation of liberalism and capitalism, as if civil and social liberty and freedom is essentially the individual “liberty” of social irresponsibility (whether by individual people or by capitalist firms as corporate individuals) and the “freedom” to exploit and oppress others.

What this ignores is that capitalism itself — the domination of society by the imperatives of producing and reproducing capital — undermines the freedom and liberty of bourgeois civil society, not only for the working class but for others as well, including the capitalists.

The social democrats complain that the social-democratic welfare state is still constrained by the dictates of capital, threatened by “capital flight,” etc., but by this they mean the nefarious actions of the capitalist class, ignoring the issue of capitalism itself in the Marxist sense. Earlier historical Marxists were much clearer about the true nature and character of the problem, which is precisely why they advocated the dictatorship of the proletariat as the beginning and not the end of political and social revolution, opening the door to and beginning the process of overcoming capitalism, and not yet beyond capitalism, let alone the achievement of socialism, itself.

The recent historical cycle of the Millennial Left failed to grasp either in theory or practice the true nature and character of the problem they faced in capitalism. They failed to become truly Marxist.

Marx argued that, short of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the state remained the “dictatorship of the bourgeoisie,” by which he meant the dictatorship of capital, or the state ruling in the interests of capital as a whole. This includes the workers who live and benefit by capital as it presently exists.

In the 20th century, the socialist and communist Left historically liquidated the Marxist vision of the necessity and possibility of the dictatorship of the proletariat not least by neglecting and abandoning the actual reasons for it.

The propaganda of working-class struggle politics by historical Marxism was mistaken in subsequent generations for theoretical substance, confusing cause and effect in capitalism. The class division and conflict between workers and capitalists was mistaken as the cause and not recognized properly as the effect of capitalism and its contradiction. The self-contradiction of social value in production between wages and capital was mistaken for a conflict of interests between workers and capitalists, with the latter regarded merely as exploitative profiteers and not as Marx saw them as “character-masks” of the greater social imperatives of capital. The workers were meant to replace the capitalist ruling class not to do away with exploitation but to make politically explicit and thus “conscious” the contradiction of capital.

Instead, socialism and communism reverted to their pre-Marxian meaning of mere social and political egalitarianism, a complaint against political and social hierarchy and the inequality in distribution and consumption between the working class and the capitalists.

The dictatorship of the proletariat was the intermediate and not ultimate political and social goal of socialist politics in capitalism, as originally understood by Marxism. While the motivations of the working-class struggle for socialism included the egalitarianism of labor — the bourgeois principles of “equal rights for all” to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” in the freedom of “liberty, equality and fraternity” in a “free association of producers” — Marxism also assumed civil and political liberty, a liberal society and political order of voluntary participation and association.

It is precisely because bourgeois society in capitalism still exhibits such liberty and embodies such an egalitarian spirit of participation that there are discontents in such terms within it and indeed that there is any social and political movement at all against its failures.

The Left has fallen apart into either accommodating capitalist politics through welfare statism or accommodating society’s disintegration in capitalism through antinomian opposition of anti-bourgeois nihilism and anti-social attitudes — including the tribalism of communitarian social-group identity politics. In either case, it has abandoned the task of socialism and the political goal of the next historically necessary step of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to begin to move society beyond capitalism.

This is why and how the Left died historically — why it remains dead today. **IP**

¹ Parts of this article also appear in Hari Kumar, “Afghanistan, feudal reaction and imperialism — a battle continues,” *The Left Berlin*, September 27, 2021, available online at <https://www.theleftberlin.com/afghanistan-feudal-reaction-and-imperialism-a-battle-continues/>.

² Chris Cutrone, “Afghanistan: After 20 and 40 years,” *Platypus Review* 139 (September 2021), available online at <https://platypus1917.org/2021/09/02/afghanistan-after-20-and-40-years/>.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Louis Dupree, *Afghanistan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 415.

⁶ Cf. W. B. Bland, *Restoration of Capitalism in the Soviet Union* (1980), available online at <http://www.oneparty.co.uk/html/book/ussrmenu.html>.

⁷ William Wedderburn, *Alan Octavian Hume, C. B.: Father of the Indian National Congress, 1829–1912* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1913), 77.

⁸ Hansard *HC Deb.* vol. 434, cols. 503–504, March 5, 1947, available online at <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1947-03-05/debates/d17d9662-ea67-452a-8469-59adef-f76e71/IndiaGovernmentPolicy>.

⁹ Raja Anwar, *Tragedy of Afghanistan* (London: Verso, 1988), 125–35.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Fred Halliday, “Revolution In Afghanistan,” *New Left Review* 112 (Nov/Dec 1978): 4–44.

¹² Dupree, *Afghanistan*, 146–47, 164–66.

¹³ Anwar, *Tragedy of Afghanistan*.

¹⁴ Halliday, “Revolution in Afghanistan.”

¹⁵ Beverley Male, *Revolutionary Afghanistan: A Reappraisal* (London: Palgrave, 1982), 65–70.

¹⁶ David Gibbs, “The peasant as counter-revolutionary: The rural origins of the Afghan insurgency,” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 21, no. 1 (1986): 36–59.

¹⁷ Anwar, “Tragedy of Afghanistan.”

¹⁸ Cf. Anwar, Dupree, Male, op.cit.

¹⁹ Ahmed Rashid, *Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 82.

²⁰ Anwar, “Tragedy of Afghanistan.”

COVID, capitalism, and communism

Karyn Pomerantz



Chemical Defense Unit, USSR, ca. 1940s.

DISASTERS REVEAL THE TRUE NATURE OF CAPITALISM, and there is no greater disaster than the state of capitalism today, from the climate, austerity programs, migration, and the pandemics of COVID and HIV. While corona is a virus that kills millions of people, capitalism imperils the entire working class. As with other disasters, it requires a revolution to eliminate its root causes and prevent new variants and pandemics. There is really no time to lose while we debate the perfect response and spend endless hours begging politicians to act.

In a nutshell, capitalism is the driver of pandemics and the major barrier to their elimination, because of its lethal physical and social effects on the working class. This article calls for a coordinated, international movement led by a party to establish a worker-controlled communist state.

Origins of COVID-19

Biologically, the coronavirus is a retrovirus that invades the cells of an animal or person, destroying cells, and leading to disease. HIV is also a retrovirus that kills immune cells, causing infections. Corona primarily damages the lungs, inducing suffocation and harming other organs as well. Vaccines prevent viral diseases, such as polio, but they do not cure them. Over time, if the viral spread continues, variants or mutations occur that may be more transmissible and deadly, such as the Delta variant. Therefore, we need to look upstream to the social and economic factors that lead to viral diseases. Corona originates in animals; it uses zoonotic transmission, spilling over from animals to humans.

Structurally, COVID-19 originates from capitalist modes of production. It is closely related to the food industry. Capitalists commodify or commercialize everything. People and animals are marketable, bought, sold, and exploited for profits accruing to a minority. The food industry is a prime example.

What are the ways the food industry causes spillovers and pandemics? Rob Wallace, an important epidemiologist writing on pandemics' structural origins in *Big Farms Make Big Flu* and *Dead Epidemiologists*, describes how major agricultural corporations like Tyson, Monsanto, and Smithfield and investors like Goldman-Sachs *externalize* profits and *socialize* the risks and costs. That is, take the loot and offload the problems on us.

Corporate irresponsibility:

- Farming closer to forests and deforestation, leading to closer contact between people and animal carriers, such as bats and chimps.
- Factory farming, caging animals like chickens and pigs in crowded conditions that reduce immunity and facilitate the spread of disease.
- Speeding up production in meatpacking plants with little protection for workers, who are "treated as sides of beef."¹
- Globalizing the production and consumption of food so that an infected pig grown in Asia can be barbecued in the US and other distant regions.
- Decreasing regulation and monitoring of production sites.

Under capitalism, the government serves the rich, whether led by Democrats or Republicans. It facilitates the spread of disease except when it threatens corporate profits. Therefore, we see governments encourage masks and vaccination while opening schools and businesses.

Government culpability for COVID-19 and other diseases include:

- Increasing worker vulnerability through austerity programs that eliminate or reduce jobs, unemployment compensation, rent cancellation, affordability and availability of food, access to health care, and housing.
- Reducing funding for 700 jobs at the CDC, which is responsible for disease prevention, surveillance, and vaccine recommendations.
- Decreasing inspections of factories.
- Spreading confusing messages. There is no national policy about prevention and protection; each state can make decisions about vaccination and masking.
- Allowing misinformation about immunizations and masking.
- Creating trade policies, such as the TRIPS agreement that protects pharmaceutical companies from sharing their vaccine and drug information, and others, like NAFTA, which prohibit countries from interfering with corporate profits.
- Enforcing immigration policies that criminalize and endanger people trying to enter the U.S. and European countries, leaving them unvaccinated, caged in crowded conditions, or living unsheltered.
- Denying asylum to thousands of Haitians and Central Americans from entering the U.S. under the guise of avoiding disease transmission, a provision of the Title 42 public health law.
- Incarcerating people in crowded conditions and denying their release, especially elderly

and sick people.

- Hoarding the vaccines and refusing to support the vaccine patent waiver to give other countries access to the technology to produce vaccines.

The effects on the working class are disastrous. As of mid-September, approximately 228,000,000 have contracted the virus, and close to 5,000,000 have died.²

Racism

COVID-19 represents the typical distribution of disease. Its morbidity, hospitalization, and mortality rates are higher for low income black, Latin, and indigenous people than better-resourced white workers on average. Because of the typical racist labor patterns, these workers provide services in retail, transportation, and hospitality, and are therefore more likely to be exposed to the virus. Many of their jobs do not provide sick leave that would allow them to heal and get the vaccine. White workers also suffer from racism. On average, their wages are higher, and their unemployment rates are lower. However, the ability of racist ideas to divide workers and create conflicts between them, imperils all workers' economic and social well-being. The unity of workers globally is critical.³

This is clearly unrelated to anything biological; there are no genetic differences between these groups. However, politicians and the public continue to blame patients for choosing unhealthy behaviors and exposures. Immigrants are often portrayed as disease vectors, and the risk of transmission to U.S. residents is used as a reason to block their entrance into the U.S.

Never mind that impoverished people live in crowded and risky environments where exposure to the coronavirus is more likely. Or that remote working is impossible because they have jobs that require face-to-face working conditions. Forget that 30,000,000 people under 65 in 2020 have no health insurance to cover medical visits with primary caregivers and secure medication for conditions that predispose them to more severe COVID-19 complications. Ignore the history of oppressive healthcare and experimentation that fosters mistrust and vaccine hesitancy.

Oppression of women

The pandemic has pulled women out of their jobs as they take primary responsibility for child-care and household tasks. Women serve as the primary commodities in the social reproduction of the working class through giving birth, raising children, and providing elder care. Women have lost \$800 billion in income globally, losing over 64 million jobs.⁴ Ten percent of U.S women left their jobs, and 47% took unpaid sick leave.⁵ These factors will increase pay and gender inequities, and reduce family income, creating family conflicts and mental stress.

Nationalism and vaccine equity

Access to vaccines follows the pattern of access to any other essential component of life. Countries like the U.S. have an abundance of vaccines, while countries in Africa have a scarcity due to the profit imperatives of the pharmaceutical companies that produced Moderna (primarily funded by NIH), Pfizer, and others. Globally, 5.5 billion doses have been given. However, 80% have been given in high- and upper-income nations and only 2 percent in Africa; low-income countries have only vaccinated 1.5 doses for every 100 people.⁶

Anti-working-class vaccine refusal

Masks, social distancing, and vaccination can reduce the risk of acquiring and spreading the virus. The U.S. promulgates a culture of individualism and selfishness. In this context, the government allows people to refuse life-saving interventions during a global pandemic under the guise of individual choice. As of this publication, unvaccinated people have flooded hospitals, pushing out patients who need elective surgery and cancer treatment, and exhausting caregivers who face a situation that is totally preventable. Idaho now allows hospitals to ration care, such as ICU beds and oxygen.

Anti-vaccination is anti-working class. Being anti-vaccination is an anti-working-class position. It is also racist since black, indigenous, and Latin workers are contracting and dying from COVID-19 at higher rates.

The right-wing nationalists inflame the anti-vaccine movement by spreading lies and attacking science. This gutter-racist and anti-science propaganda serves to divide the working class of the United States. The white nationalists want to continue the terms that represent the brutality of racism that our class has felt for centuries. They want to silence us by turning a rational and scientific response to a deadly disease into a personal choice under the guise of freedom. Freedom is the understanding of necessity not reckless actions that endanger the world.

Teachers and health care providers who refuse vaccination under the excuse that it is "my body, my choice," belittle the very real struggle women have over their own means of reproduction. They are a

danger to their students and patients, as well as their families and themselves.

The history of racist and sexist medical experiments worldwide rightly sows distrust in the medical establishment and the government. However, when vaccination is soundly based on scientific evidence, vaccine hesitancy will cause black and Latin students and their families to suffer more. The bosses have their own reasons for wanting to get us to sacrifice for the social good, like protecting their profits and building for war, but we need to fight for workers to serve our own interests. It is not "segregation" to quarantine potential disease carriers during a global pandemic!

Amid a pandemic, people who vaccinate exemplify social responsibility to their fellow workers to keep the vulnerable from dying. Participation in vaccine clinical trials and the dedication of healthcare workers are other displays of social responsibility. Whether conscious or not, they serve the working class.

Organizing goals: reforms, socialism, or communism?

These causes and effects can help us determine our goals. Exploitation, the ability of capitalists to make profit from workers' production, forms the basis of capitalism. Elections, union organizing, legislation, collectives, mutual aid, or social safety nets do not abolish this fundamental feature. They do not change the class of people who control the economy and government, who can always take back any gains workers make. The calls for abolition of prisons and policing may win some changes, such as using mental-health social workers instead of police officers to intervene in confrontations. However, the ruling class will not eliminate police departments since they are essential to control workers. The ruling class will not create the social conditions that reduce the impoverishment behind many criminalized activities, such as drug wars or sex work. Do we really want to free killer cops like Derek Chauvin or allow many others to work unindicted and unconvicted?

To prevent outbreaks like corona, workers need to seize and maintain power. A communist society based on collective ownership of land, resources, and production can create humane and safe means of food production. It can eliminate wages that create hierarchies of inequality. Without profit and exploitation, we can reduce racist practices and beliefs, and socialize (share) so-called women's work with public childcare, cooking and dining, and respite for parents.

Communism differs from socialism in these major ways. Socialism maintains a wage system, uses elections to "win," and doesn't change the class controlling industry. It does redistribute resources to workers and promotes healthy policies. However, socialists cannot achieve equality without taking control, and capitalists do not relinquish power without a tremendous armed battle.

Communism espouses similar goals that socialists have. However, it will abolish the wage system that ranks workers in a hierarchy based on jobs and wages. People will contribute services and receive the necessities, recognizing that we all have basic needs. Families with more children or medical problems will receive housing, food, and care based on these needs. Communists organize a party to debate political positions, organize struggles, and deploy people to different issues. They unite workers from around the world to fight racism, the oppression of women, and poverty, recognizing that capitalism oppresses workers of all nationalities and so-called racial categories. Communists use democratic centralism to make and carry out decisions, spending as much time as necessary to decide and then having everyone implement the decision. We can learn from the mistakes of the Soviet Union and China as we develop new ways to organize society and make new mistakes. Both societies allowed bourgeois (business) people to share power with the working class, thinking that they would support communist goals. They didn't. Capitalism wasn't born in a day; communism will develop and advance as we learn what works to achieve our goals.

In the field of public health, the state can pour people and other resources into scientific research, vaccinations, health care for all, and decent living conditions.

After the revolution in Russia, people's health improved dramatically due to improved nutrition and housing. Life expectancy increased by close to 30 years by 1970, and infant mortality dropped from 250 deaths per 1000 births to 20 per 1000 births. The Soviet government aimed to eliminate all infectious diseases, often using authoritarian means. It created the Sanitation and Epidemiology Service to identify and quarantine people with infections, vaccinate populations, conduct medical research, and build medical schools, plague-research labs, and sanitation training centers; its reach and effects spread into nearly every Soviet village. While many may condemn their forceful measures, they eliminated infectious diseases, including cholera, TB, tetanus, typhoid, measles, and whooping cough. The director of the major research lab said that the interventions worked, "and isn't that what mattered?" When the Soviet Union dissolved, life expectancy plummeted and chronic diseases increased as the government stopped funding research.⁷

The Chinese communist state also achieved huge improvements in public health after the 1949 Revolution. It mobilized masses of people to remove snails from waterways to successfully stop the spread of schistosomiasis, offered jobs to drug dealers and sex workers to end their practices, and legalized divorce so women could leave exploitative relationships.⁸ They also mobilized young people to train as teachers and "barefoot doctors," the forebears of physician assistants. Deployed to the rural villages, they increased literacy and provided basic healthcare that villagers never had.⁹ Many people who condemn the Cultural Revolution are wealthier people who lost their personal wealth and position without hearing the voices of poorer workers.

Organizing strategies: reform struggles, mutual aid, anti-racism; Left/liberal errors

Our goals influence our organizing strategies. People trying to reform capitalism, such as demanding higher wages or voting rights, focus on lobbying politicians and staging rallies for the media.

Building cooperatives is another popular strategy. People hope these non-profit worker- and community-owned enterprises will grow and overwhelm capitalism. However, these cannot scale up to include everyone, and more importantly, there will never be a peaceful change of power and economic systems (see South Africa!).

There are some important benefits of reforms. First, we cannot sit by and do nothing when our brothers and sisters suffer so much from COVID, hunger, climate disasters, and the lack of housing. Second, campaigns teach us how the system works, whom we can trust, and how to breach divisions. Most importantly, we can meet people who want to fight for more.

However, continuing to vote for politicians who claim to be against pharma greed but vote against negotiating drug prices in Medicare or who claim to be concerned about climate change but support fossil-fuel industries, is clearly a losing strategy. Spending weeks and months with legislators, who pass legislation that will be vetoed or make speeches when they already know a reform is doomed, is another time and life waster for progressive folks.

Mutual aid is often charity rather than class solidarity, but many good folks are in this effort. This is an early form of political commitment that mirrors the adage "from each according to political commitment and to each according to need."¹⁰ The selfless rescue missions of ordinary people, including white men evacuating black families from flooded homes during Hurricane Katrina, demonstrate the solidarity of workers facing disasters. Rebecca Solnit, in *A Paradise Built in Hell: The Extraordinary Communities That Arise in Disaster* (2010), presents the stories of workers providing recovery and mutual aid that the government refused to provide. While mutual aid cannot replace the working class in power, it builds trust and solidarity among neighbors and can be used to make demands on the government and raise revolutionary ideas.

Many public health workers have felt overwhelmed by the efforts to deal with structural racism, COVID-19 disparities, pandemic unemployment, and evictions. Energized by the George Floyd protests many felt that change might really be possible. Efforts to remove police from schools and replace police with mental-health advocates seemed like a no-brainer. Certainly, the pandemic made it seem like mutual aid in neighborhoods could help workers survive while a new government could keep workers solvent and housed. Few thought the Democratic Biden government would allow people to lose unemployment benefits and refuse rent cancellation. Zoom connected people all over the world in vibrant discussions and organizing; surely that solidarity would help build the movement. Vaccines of all sorts would stop COVID. Workers would be respected, and universal healthcare would be the logical solution just like free vaccinations.

Unfortunately, the expanded activity has not guaranteed any of these things. State power still resides with finance capital on Wall Street and the bankers and industrialists of the U.S. Racism and sexism remain unchecked and worsened in many areas.

Police murder continues. More families lose loved ones, including white people, but disproportionately among black and Latin workers. The criminal legal system continues to incarcerate at the same rate so that jails that were partially emptied during COVID are back in strength during Delta. School-board members and residents with BLM signs in their yards resist changes to policing in schools and neighborhoods.

Internationally fascist groups are gaining strength, and the EU does not even want to support the TRIPS waiver to make vaccine production possible around the globe. China is now seizing its opportunity in Afghanistan to expand its Belt and Road Initiative, tightening its control over Hong Kong and the Uyghurs, and building its military in the South China Sea. Vaccine imperialism is a new concept as Chinese vaccines compete in South America and Africa.

The only hope for the working classes of the world is a communist revolution built on antiracism and working-class solidarity, rejecting all alliances with anti-U.S. imperialist powers, such as China. If destroying capitalism is our goal, it is urgent to unite the working class, including GLs, conduct political education to win hearts and minds, and recruit masses of people to the party. Meeting activists in the struggles for reform is necessary, but only using our time to build a revolutionary communist party with the outlook of seizing state power can be worth anything in the long and short run. We invite you to join the Progressive Labor Party, read our newspaper, *Challenge-Desafio* at plp.org, and join our study groups. **IP**

¹ Rob Wallace, *Dead Epidemiologists: On the Origins of COVID-19* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2020).

² "Coronavirus in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count," *New York Times*, available online at <<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/covid-cases.html>>.

³ See <multiracialunity.org> for articles promoting this argument.

⁴ "COVID-19 cost women globally over \$800 billion in lost income in one year," *Oxfam International*, April 29, 2021, available online at <<https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/covid-19-cost-women-globally-over-800-billion-lost-income-one-year>>.

⁵ Usha Ranji, Brittini Frederiksen, Alina Salganicoff, and Michelle Long, "Women, Work, and Family During COVID-19: Findings from the KFF Women's Health Survey," *Kaiser Family Foundation*, March 22, 2021, available online at <<https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/issue-brief/women-work-and-family-during-covid-19-findings-from-the-kff-womens-health-survey/>>.

⁶ Tyler Pager, Laurie McGinley, and Dan Diamond, "U.S. to buy hundreds of millions more doses of Pfizer vaccine to donate to the world," *Washington Post*, September 17, 2021, available online at <<https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/09/17/biden-pfizer-vaccine-global/>>.

⁷ Laurie Garrett, *Betrayal of Trust: The Collapse of Global Public Health* (New York: Hyperion, 2000).

⁸ Joshua S. Horn, *Away with All Pests: An English Surgeon in People's China, 1954-1969* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971).

⁹ Dongping Han, *The Unknown Cultural Revolution: Life and Change in a Chinese Village* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2008). See also an interview with Han that was part of the symposium, "Rediscovering China's Cultural Revolution 1966-76: Art and Politics, Lived Experience, Legacies of Liberation," hosted by Revolution Books at the University of California at Berkeley, November 6, 2009, available online at <<https://www.c-span.org/video/?290017-1/the-unknown-cultural-revolution>>.

¹⁰ A play on a phrase from Karl Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme" (1875).